

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed February 26, 2008. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 13-20, 50, and 51 are pending in this application, with claim 13 being the independent claim. Claims 1-12 and 21-49 have been canceled.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13, 14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,621,451 to Fisher et al. (“Fisher”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0263516 to Michail et al. (“Michail”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,335,319 to Obata (“Obata”). This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the present amendments.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite “mapping the texture to the triangles using perspective correction.” Fisher, Michail and Obata each fail to disclose this element. The Examiner cites Ikeda in the rejection of claim 17 as applying a perspective transformation, but even Ikeda fails to disclose “mapping the texture to the triangles using perspective correction.” Accordingly, claim 13 distinguishes over the cited prior art. Claims 14 and 20 depend on claim 13 and distinguish over the cited references at least for that reason.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher, Michail, Obata, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,000 to Richens. (“Richens”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Richens fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 15 distinguishes over the cited references at least for depending on claim 13.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher, Michail, Obata, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0263516 to Mukoyama et al. (“Mukoyama”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Mukoyama fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 16 distinguishes over the cited references at least for depending on

claim 13.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher Michail, Obata, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,881 to Ikeda. (“Ikeda”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Ikeda fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 17 distinguishes over the cited references at least for depending on claim 13.

Claim 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher, Michail, Obata, and further in view of “Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice, Second Edition” by Foley (“Foley”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Foley fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 18 and 19 distinguish over the cited references at least for depending on claim 13.

New Claims

Support for new claims 50 and 51 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0017] of the originally filed application. The elements of claims 50 and 51 are not disclosed in the cited prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: May 27, 2008 By: /CHAD C. ANDERSON, REG. NO. 44505/
Chad C. Anderson
(480) 385-5060